

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD
to the
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

October 20-21, 2020

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAB – Citizens Advisory Board
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
DOE – US Department of Energy
D&D – Deactivation & Decommissioning
DWPF – Defense Waste Processing Facility
EM – (DOE) Office of Environmental Management
EMAB – Environmental Management Advisory Board
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board
EPA – US Environmental Protection Agency
ETTP – East Tennessee Technology Park
FEM – Field Element Manager
Hanford – (DOE) Hanford Site
HAB – Hanford Advisory Board
HLW – High-Level Waste
ICP CAB – Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board
LFRG – Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Federal Review Group
Nevada SSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board
NNM CAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board
NNSA – National Nuclear Security Administration
NNSS – Nevada Nuclear Security Site
OMB – The Office of Management and Budget
ORNL – Oak Ridge National Laboratory
OR SSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board
Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory Board
Portsmouth – (DOE) Portsmouth Site
PPE – Personal Protective Equipment
PORTS SSAB – Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board
SRS – (DOE) Savannah River Site
SRNL – Savannah River National Laboratory
SRS CAB – Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
SWPF – Salt Waste Processing Facility
TRU – Transuranic Waste
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Shelley Cimon, Vice-Chair; Carrie Meyer, DOE Communications; James Lynch, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO); Dana Gribble, Staff

Idaho National Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board: Brad Christensen, Chair; Teri Ehresman, Vice-Chair; Connie Flohr, ICP CAB Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Danielle Miller, Federal Coordinator; Jordan Davies, Staff

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board: Frank Bonesteel, Chair; Dick Gardner, Vice-Chair; Barbara Ulmer, Staff; Jesse Sleezer, Navarro Strategic Communications Manager; Rob Boehlecke, Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Bill Wilborn, Alternate Deputy Designated Federal Officer

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Bob Hull, Chair; Joshua Madalena, Vice-Chair; Menice Santistevan, Staff; Bridget Maestas, Staff

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: Shell Lohmann, Chair; Leon Shields, Vice-Chair; Melyssa Noe, Alternate Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Shelley Kimmel, Staff; Sara McManamy-Johnson, Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Don Barger, Chair; Victoria Caldwell, Vice-Chair; Eric Roberts, Meeting Facilitator

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Bob Berry, Chair; Carlton Cave, Vice-Chair; Greg Simonton, Federal Coordinator; Julie Galloway, Staff; Rick Greene, Staff

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Gil Allensworth, Chair; Gregg Murray, Vice-Chair; de'Lisa Carrico, Federal Coordinator; James Tanner, Staff; Heather McWilliams, Staff

DOE Headquarters:

Todd Shrader, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM)
Betsy Connell, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory & Policy Affairs
Steve Trischman, Director, Office of Budget and Planning, EM
Justin Marble, LFRG Co-Chair, Office of Waste Disposal, EM
Sherri Ross, LFRG Co-Chair, Office of Regulatory Compliance, EM
Joceline Nahigian, Director, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs, EM
Kelly Snyder, Acting EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer
Alyssa Harris, EM SSAB Federal Coordinator

MEETING MINUTES

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB or Board) Chairs met virtually on October 20-21, 2020. Participants included EM SSAB officers and members, DOE staff, and contractor support staff. The meeting was open to the public and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

A recording of this meeting can be viewed at the following links:

[EM SSAB Chairs Meeting Day 1](#)

[EM SSAB Chairs Meeting Day 2](#)

Day 1

Opening Remarks

Mr. Eric Roberts, contractor support for the Paducah and Portsmouth Advisory Boards and meeting facilitator, welcomed all virtual attendees and reviewed the logistics of the meeting. All Chairs and Vice-Chairs introduced themselves. Mr. Roberts explained that the entire meeting would be livestreamed on YouTube.

EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer Ms. Kelly Snyder introduced the first speaker: Mr. Todd Shrader, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM.

Mr. Shrader began with a review of EM's recent organizational changes. He then discussed the continued progress of EM during COVID-19, highlighting the priority of health and safety, the phased approach for work at each site based on the risk and guidelines, and lessons learned as a result of the pandemic.

Mr. Shrader then discussed the EM calendar year 2020 mission and priorities. This included achieving significant construction project milestones, executing key projects that enable the EM cleanup mission, reducing the EM complex footprint, awarding contracts that enable accelerated progress, and driving innovation and improved performance.

Mr. Shrader highlighted site accomplishments, such as the start-up of the Salt Waste Processing Facility at Savannah River Site (SRS), the completion of Vision 2020 Deactivation & Decommissioning (D&D) activities at the East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP), and progress on the Direct Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) initiative at Hanford.

Mr. Shrader then discussed EM's Strategic Vision that was adopted earlier this year and the intention for the Strategic Vision to be a concise, high-level document readable by outside parties, both on the federal, state, and local levels. He urged groups to submit input on project priorities, end state visions, and opportunities for acceleration. He recognized that the individual boards may not be meeting as regularly this year, and encouraged any feedback to be emailed to StrategicVisionFeedback@em.doe.gov.

Mr. Shrader opened the floor for questions from the sites. Ms. Susan Leckband (HAB) asked if there would be increased transparency while crafting the Strategic Vision. Mr. Shrader answered yes, EM is dedicated to transparency and welcomes input from the EM SSAB.

Mr. Bob Hull (NNM CAB) asked how the pandemic and government spending would affect continued progress in phase three. Mr. Shrader replied that he does not have the specifics of how each site will respond to phase three but will keep the group updated.

Mr. Gregg Murray (SRS CAB) asked how much the pandemic has affected progress within EM. Mr. Shrader responded that it depends on the location of the site and the scope of the project. For example, the biggest challenges have been at sites with heavy Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) usage, such as Hanford and SRS. He said that that work is beginning to come back online as safety precautions can be established.

Chairs Round Robin

Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB)

Mr. Brad Christensen said that the ICP CAB is focused on two topics: protection of the Snake River Plain Aquifer through monitoring and milestones related to compliance of the Idaho Settlement Agreement. The ICP CAB's goals for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 include encouraging a solution for a long-term high-level waste repository and monitoring the transition between contractors at Idaho for minimal impact to efficiency and safety.

Savannah River Site (SRS)

Mr. Gil Allensworth began discussing the start-up of SWPF, which will allow SRS to process their salt waste to be vitrified at Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF). He also discussed the current progress to Saltstone Disposal Unit builds.

Mr. Allensworth said that they are awaiting an update to the current Savannah River National Lab (SRNL) contract and hope for a smooth transition into the new contract.

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (Portsmouth SSAB)

Mr. Bob Berry said that the Portsmouth SSAB is continuing an education series concerning environmental monitoring which include the continued discussion on how to provide time, contextual information to the surrounding communities and interested stakeholders.

Mr. Berry also discussed the Portsmouth SSAB's efforts over the past several months to study DOE's environmental monitoring process and objectives—including data reporting. The board was working toward recommendations on data delivery and educating the community on environmental reporting. COVID-19 and quarantining requirements have paused this process.

Mr. Berry reported that the Portsmouth SSAB was in discussions with DOE on potential infrastructure that can be transferred as a viable asset for economic development. Mr. Berry indicated that economic development at the site is a major issue with the community, and ongoing discussions with DOE about transferring certain infrastructure—water, electric, sewer, rail, etc.—helps enhance the site for reindustrialization.

Mr. Berry presented the Portsmouth SSAB's goals for 2021 including increasing board membership to more accurately reflect the community. He said that the board currently has nine members, and adding more members will improve community engagement. Additionally, the board wishes to provide more input on the future of the site's infrastructure.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB)

Mr. Don Barger discussed Paducah's footprint reduction which lessens DOE's financial burden for site upkeep and increases available dollars for cleanup and the public relations initiative for stakeholders, including the Groundwater Success Story.

For FY 2021, Mr. Barger hopes to find a safe, healthy way to continue the board's work despite the current pandemic restrictions. He said the board also hopes to develop working relationships with new regulators as turnover happens at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and with Kentucky regulators.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)

Ms. Leckband discussed the board's accomplishments – passing five pieces of advice and holding the yearly work plan meeting to approve the meeting schedule and work plan for 2021.

Ms. Shelley Cimon then discussed the cross-cutting issue of tank waste remediation and disposition as well as maintaining cleanup progress and worker safety during the pandemic. She

discussed issues with supply chains to secure the necessary PPE to continue Hanford's progress. For FY 2021, the HAB would like to return to in-person meetings and develop informed, relevant advice and recommendations to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies. Ms. Cimon believes the board should think about how to restructure their meetings.

Ms. Leckband discussed upcoming activities and challenges the HAB faces. This includes onboarding new members, the election of Chair and Vice-Chair, the passing of information from outgoing board members to new leadership, and returning to in-person meetings to engage the public.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB)

Ms. Shell Lohmann began discussing the transfer of ETTP and the groundwater remedy selection. She noted that many of the 200 plus recommendations the ORSSAB provided to the site addressed cleanup and historic preservation of ETTP.

Ms. Lohmann said that hundreds of buildings were demolished and more than 1.7 million cubic yards of waste were disposed of, which has allowed DOE to transfer 1,300 acres back to the community. Land was also set aside for historic preservation, conservation, and recreational use. The ORSSAB participated in four virtual events hosted by DOE and its contractors detailing this accomplishment.

Regarding the groundwater remedy selection at ETTP, Ms. Lohmann said that the site released its completed ETTP Main Plant Groundwater Feasibility Study in late November and will soon select a preferred remediation option. She explained that this is the first time ORSSAB will get to weigh in on final options to address groundwater contamination within the main plant area (known as Zone 2) at ETTP where most of the groundwater contamination is located due to the major facilities associated with uranium enriched and related activities during the Manhattan Project.

Regarding cross-cutting topics, Ms. Lohmann discussed the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) 5-Year Review and its purpose to determine whether the remedies undertaken protect human health and the environment and to evaluate implementation and performance of those remedies and implement any changes. She also discussed the shift of cleanup focus to the Oak Ridge National Lab (ORNL) & Y-12 with new authority to do so.

Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board (NNM CAB)

Mr. Bob Hull presented the NNM CAB's cross-cutting topics, leading with EM funding. Mr. Hull commented that in the state of New Mexico, citizens can only gather in groups of five and he is concerned about the amount of funding available when larger groups can gather in the future. He also discussed the importance of empowering NNM CAB committees to develop recommendations despite the ongoing coronavirus guidelines—many of which have.

For FY 2021, Mr. Hull outlined the NNM CAB's goals to have a significant input on the content of the next revision to the Order on Consent between the New Mexico Environment Department and DOE EM-LA, as well as making public outreach more effective, particularly engaging constituents in outlying communities.

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB)

Mr. Frank Bonesteel said the board is interested in historical preservation, such as a museum detailing the history of clean-up activities at the site. However, the ongoing national security work at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) creates an issue of having a publicly-available museum. He noted the Atomic Testing Museum in Las Vegas is the current alternative, but the location is 60 miles away from NNSS.

Regarding cross-cutting topics, Mr. Bonesteel discussed the many questions surrounding the transportation of waste to NNSS's Area 5 Radioactive Waste Management Complex, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and commercial sites. He said he would like to hear specifics on how other sites deal with planning capacities, routes, etc.

Ms. Leckband noted that Mr. Bonesteel did not mention the disposal of high-level waste at the Nevada site and if he had any views on this. Mr. Bonesteel said that the NSSAB has many views concerning high-level waste, but the concern of high-level waste falls outside the purview of the NSSAB, so they left it off the list.

With the conclusion of the presentations, Mr. Shrader thanked the boards for bringing their issues forward.

Budget Updates

Ms. Snyder introduced Mr. Steve Trischman, Director of Budget and Planning of EM. Mr. Trischman started by explaining the budget prioritization process and how the EM SSAB's input is considered in the process.

Mr. Trischman explained the planning and budget lifecycle for each cleanup site. According to Mr. Trischman, the budget begins with a federal baseline depending on factors specific to the

site. He noted the boards can be helpful by providing input on the desired end-state for the site, the waste disposition path for the site, or the priorities of work scopes for EM to tackle.

Mr. Trischman then walked through the planning phase of the life cycle and how boards can provide input at this stage by ranking priorities. He then discussed the rules of engagement for the life cycle and said that internal discussions regarding the budget are embargoed. Mr. Trischman explained the budget and planning timeline each FY, and how stakeholder input is utilized throughout the budget planning process.

Looking at the budget trends for FY 2019 and 2020, and looking ahead to FY 2021, Mr. Trischman discussed the differences of the requested budgets and enacted budgets, based on what is submitted by the White House and what Congress ultimately appropriates.

Mr. Trischman concluded the presentation with the status of what lies ahead for FY 2021 and the outlook for FY 2022. He noted that currently, EM is operating under a Continuing Resolution through December 11, 2020. The FY 2022 Congressional Budget is scheduled to be released February 1, 2021.

Mr. Roberts thanked Mr. Trischman for his presentation, and opened the floor for questions.

Ms. Teri Ehresman (ICP CAB) asked what will happen if Congress fails to pass a Continuing Resolution by December 11 and what the protocol is for the sites. Mr. Trischman said he didn't think that would happen, but that EM is lucky that their funding does not expire and that some sites have many months of carry-over funding.

Ms. Leckband asked what has changed that the stakeholders are not able to see the local dollars requested by the boards before submitting their requests to HQ. Mr. Trischman noted that since he's been in his position, they could not share specific funding levels due to the embargo. He said he would get back to her on the language that indicates they could not share the specific line items. Ms. Leckband noted they used to be able to see the full amounts and would prefer to see all dollars in order to give accurate advice.

Mr. Allensworth noted that the SRS CAB feels as though they do get plenty of information from their budget contact at the site, though it is not exact dollar amounts. Ms. Shelly Cimon also noted there has been a drop-off of the amount of budget information that is passed down to the SSABs.

Mr. Barger inquired how the changing of an administration will affect the budget process. Mr. Trischman answered that in 2017, the FY 2018 budget was delayed and that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) gave EM their budget figures sans a discussion. He said that if

the administration changes then it does not dramatically change the budget because Congress will ultimately decide the funding levels. Overall, it is difficult to predict how things will shift.

Mr. Roberts concluded the meeting with a preview of tomorrow's agenda. The meeting adjourned at 2:51 PM ET.

Day 2

Waste Management and Regulatory Affairs Update

Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory and Policy Affairs Ms. Betsy Connell thanked all EM SSAB members for their resilience and dedication to the Board's mission in a remote environment.

Ms. Connell highlighted some major National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) actions this year.

- Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for Defense Waste Processing Facility Wastewater (first action associated with the HLW interpretation)
- Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Disposition of Waste and Materials
- Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision for Disposition of Depleted Uranium Oxide Conversion Product Generated from DOE's Inventory of Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride (Kentucky, Ohio, Tennessee)

Ms. Connell also discussed the Council on Environmental Quality's Final Rule made in June, which is the first update to NEPA rules in 40 years. This rule updates government-wide NEPA regulations, integrates enhanced flexibilities, and provides opportunities for earlier stakeholder engagement throughout the NEPA process. She said that more information on this is accessible online.

Ms. Connell highlighted the implementation of the HLW interpretation to the first waste stream as a significant accomplishment. In September 2019, a sample retrieval from SRS's DWPF recycled wastewater was shipped to Waste Control Specialists, LLC in Texas.

Ms. Connell acknowledged that WIPP's shipping schedules were affected by COVID-19, but have continued at a limited capacity.

Ms. Connell discussed the Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Federal Review Group (LFRG) and their recent revision of the Operating Disposal Authorization Statement for SRS's Saltstone

Disposal Facility. The LFRG completed a review and authorized Hanford to distribute the preliminary Performance Assessment for A/AX Tank Farm Closure to Washington State regulatory staff in support of a regulatory milestone.

Ms. Connell reviewed the status of Waste Incidental to Reprocessing, noting that they completed consultation with NRC and review of the Final Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C at the Hanford Site. EM initiated NRC consultation for the Hanford DFLAW WIR, that supports startup of DFLAW and disposal of vitrified low activity waste at Integrated Disposal Facility.

Ms. Connell said that EM provides annual core support to the Nuclear Radiation Studies Board, a Committee of volunteer scientific experts, to advise EM on a range of topics including, low-dose radiation effects, risk assessment and communication, research investments, nuclear alternative fuel cycles, waste treatment and disposal, etc. She also said that the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine recently completed two congressionally-mandated studies: Treatment Options for Supplemental Low-Activity Waste at the Hanford Site (February 2020) & Evaluation of EM Technology Development Program Investments (2019).

Ms. Connell said that the Cleanup Dialogue, a collaborative partnership among DOE, EPA, and the States, has three active workgroups to share information and develop policies and tools on dispute resolution, waste disposition, and environmental indicators.

Ms. Connell provided an update on EM's stakeholder and intergovernmental program, including active communication on the EM Strategic Vision. She said that the 2020 Combined Intergovernmental Meeting will take place virtually in November this year.

Ms. Connell discussed the recent establishment of DOE's Long-Term Stewardship Working Group (comprised of EM, DOE Office of Legacy Management, and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA)).

Ms. Connell said that in March 2020, a Trilateral Agreement was signed between the United States (DOE EM), the United Kingdom Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Atomic Energy Canada Limited to extend international collaboration in the areas of startup and Commissioning, In Situ Decommissioning, Near Surface Disposal Facilities, Aging Infrastructure Management, and Stakeholder Engagement.

Ms. Connell said that EM held virtual workshops in May and July 2020 with Japan's Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry and with U.S. and Japanese industry to exchange information on U.S. companies' experience with decommissioning and discuss potential opportunities for collaboration on decommissioning projects in Japan.

Radioactive Waste Management Presentation

Dr. Justin Marble and Ms. Sherri Ross presented an overview of Radioactive Waste Management requirements implemented across DOE. Ms. Ross began with the legislative history of the radioactive waste management requirements beginning with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Ms. Ross then described the different waste classes, the regulatory responsibilities of each class, and the corresponding disposition path.

Ms. Ross defined High-Level Radioactive Waste (HLW) or Transuranic Radioactive (TRU) Waste. HLW is highly radioactive waste material resulting from the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. TRU Waste is waste containing more than 100 nanocuries (nCi/g) of alpha-emitting transuranic isotopes per gram of waste, with half-lives greater than 20 years, except for: 1) HLW; 2) waste that DOE and EPA agree does not need the degree of isolation of such disposal; or 3) waste that NRC has approved for disposal.

Ms. Ross then walked through other definitions including Low-Level Radioactive Waste (LLW), Mixed Waste, Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), and CERCLA.

Ms. Ross discussed the self-regulated authority implementation as implemented through the DOE directives system. Ms. Ross explained the authorities and offices that oversee the program including DOE HQ's role and responsibilities as well as the LFRG.

Ms. Ross detailed the responsibilities of the Field Element Manager (FEM) who is responsible for maintaining the site-wide radioactive waste management program, among other responsibilities, and the Radioactive Waste Management Basis, which is required to handle all radioactive facilities, operations, and activities.

Ms. Ross then explained waste classification including its definition, requirements, and the classification process.

Dr. Marble continued the presentation discussing the life-cycle planning of waste. He described the general process of planning the life-cycle and the various paths that waste can go through during the disposal process. He presented a map that outlines both the open and closed waste generator sites around the United States.

Dr. Marble presented the requirements for a receiving facility to accept waste noting that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Department of Transportation (DOT), and host states may have additional requirements. He then walked through the transfer and transportation of

waste, followed by the storage and disposal details of LLW, which included a map of DOE and commercial disposal options across the U.S.

Dr. Marble discussed the performance objectives for DOE onsite disposal sites which include the threshold doses allowed for exposure pathways. CERCLA DOE facilities must meet substantive requirements of the DOE Order and must demonstrate compliance with dose requirements. He then showed a chart comparing the average dosage of DOE requirements with daily activities such as air travel and mammogram. Dr. Marble then moved to TRU waste management and disposal, discussing the process and storage of TRU waste.

Mr. Allensworth asked if Barnwell is included with SRS. Ms. Ross answered that Barnwell is located directly next to SRS. Mr. Allensworth asked who is creating waste and who is accepting waste. Dr. Marble referred to the Waste Generator Site map to highlight the locations. Mr. Allensworth responded that SRS is still creating waste and still accepts waste for downblending. Ms. Ross responded that SRS is shown as both a Waste Generator Site and a disposal site on both maps.

Mr. Hull asked whether the change from source-based definition to the risk-based definition is fully implemented across all sites. Ms. Ross said it is not fully implemented and that at this time there is no plan to implement at Hanford, one implementation of the high-level waste risk-based interpretation at SRS, and DOE is evaluating where we go from here.

Ms. Cimon asked about the role of FEM because she hasn't explored the role for Hanford. She commented that this is the person that approves the generation of waste with no disposal pathway and she wanted to understand that process more—specifically the generation of waste with no disposal pathway.

Ms. Ross said that the generation of waste with no pathway is generally frowned upon and additional approval is required. If waste with no pathway is requested, additional approvals must happen. She used an example at SRS that was a one-off situation, explaining that special attention must be taken to request and then approved prior to the generation of waste with no pathway for disposal. Dr. Marble said that this is not a normal occurrence at sites and that volumes are typically very small. He commented that all other options are exhausted before they consider generating waste with no pathway.

EM SSAB Charges

Ms. Snyder presented new EM SSAB charges from EM based on feedback from previous meetings. She explained that these will be multi-step charges that EM SSAB members will work

on prior to the spring 2021 EM SSAB Chairs meeting. Based on the work at that meeting, the Chairs will bring a final draft into the Fall 2021 meeting.

Ms. Snyder explained the first charge, asking the EM SSAB to develop a best practices white paper that the Department could use as a guide to augment existing site outreach programs and set expectations for future outreach activities.

She asked each board to identify existing outreach practices performed at their site by both the SSAB and DOE. This includes but is not limited to, STEM outreach, budget prioritization, and in-person or virtual events. She stated that each board should identify gaps or areas where outreach could be expanded and provide suggestions to augment the program.

Ms. Snyder commented that she recognizes each board is different and communities vary from site to site, so DOE understands this is not one-size-fits-all. However, they hope the SSABs can present their findings and put together a white paper following the spring Chairs meeting and before the fall 2021 Chairs meeting. At the spring 2021 meeting, Chairs can decide the best way to draft this white paper (subcommittees, more meetings, etc).

Before moving to the second charge, Ms. Snyder asked if there were any questions on the first charge.

Mr. Christensen commented that he is excited to get the feedback from each site and hear from the fellow Chairs.

Mr. Allensworth asked if EM is asking for more time commitment from board members, which could be a potential issue. Ms. Snyder replied that it may take some time for members to develop this. She has already spoken with board staff about the project, and DOE and its contractors are prepared to assist with supporting the white paper. She stated that she does think this will require additional work by members and because this is happening at the beginning of the FY, boards can build this into their FY plan. She recognized the boards are volunteers and their time is valuable.

Ms. Snyder said that she would send out a copy of the charges after the meeting.

Ms. Cimon commented that due to COVID-19, boards are not sure how they can come up with outreach efforts since current efforts are on pause. Ms. Snyder replied that boards should look beyond COVID-19 as well as at what sites were doing prior to the pandemic. She said one idea may be to create a column to indicate if outreach happened pre- or post-COVID-19. She stated that this is a long-term recommendation and not just what SSABs can do during a pandemic.

Ms. Lohmann agreed that it would be important to have a pre-COVID and post-COVID set and then a recommendation based on both. She noted her board has not met during the pandemic and they may not meet in November or December. Due to this, most of the work involving the charge would fall to the Chair and Vice-Chair since the boards are not currently meeting. Ms. Snyder appreciated the feedback and asked boards to try to start putting together the information, but to flag if the timing is not working out because of the pandemic. She said that if in order to get the best white paper the board needs to meet in-person, they should make that point known.

Mr. Roberts clarified that the Chairs are not putting together the template, but instead evaluating an existing template to identify areas of opportunity or gaps in outreach. Ms. Snyder agreed.

Mr. Allensworth agreed with Ms. Lohmann but noted that the community does not recognize the differences in missions within SRS as a double-mission site. Ms. Kelly noted that she is from Nevada, which is also a double-mission site. She said that EM's cleanup is different from the national security aspect of the site. She recommended that, in terms of this specific charge, to include that type of information in their report when identifying gaps. She said that once we know this is an issue at multiple sites, then this is something that the Chairs can tackle. She noted that identifying repeat questions or patterns will be important.

Mr. Murray commented that he hopes along the process, SSABs can get people who do professional outreach to come in and advise the boards on how to focus further down the line as the boards embark on this project. Ms. Snyder noted that was a good point, and said she would explore that idea for the spring Chairs meeting.

Ms. Cimon noted that the contractors are changing right now and the Hanford site has lost their main outreach contractors. Because of these changes, she is having a hard time realizing how to approach the charge. Ms. Snyder replied that she understands her concern, and many contracts are written to include the outreach piece, so if the site is having problems pulling the information for the charge, to let HQ know.

Ms. Snyder pointed out that the second charge will also be additional work, and if the boards have an issue with the workload, to think about which charges are a higher priority to determine which one to tackle first.

Ms. Snyder stated that the next charge is to identify EM SSAB end-state expectations and guiding principles that could be used as a complex-wide framework for DOE EM's interaction with stakeholders and communities. She clarified that they if there are portions of the site coming to an end-state before the entire site, it would be okay to weigh in on those, too.

Ms. Snyder continued that each board will document their expectations regarding what EM mission completion looks like at their site and the Board's expectations for how DOE EM will interact with local stakeholders and communities to reach that vision.

Ms. Snyder said that she would like each Board to present their results during the spring 2021 Chairs meeting and for the Chairs to work collaboratively to discuss the individual Board results, identify commonalities and develop a complex-wide EM SSAB expectations and guiding principles framework between spring 2021 and fall 2021.

Ms. Snyder clarified that this is strictly for the EM program. She said that she knows some sites may be turning the land over to NNSA or other entities, but this charge is only about EM's responsibilities.

Mr. Allensworth noted that SRS is projected to close in 2067, so looking ahead to that timeline is difficult for completing this charge. Ms. Snyder recognizes she said "end-state" but clarified that other projects can be concluded. She asked him to look at programs at SRS that will conclude before the entire end-state occurs.

Ms. Lohmann asked Ms. Snyder to clarify if they are looking to make sure the EM SSABs and EM are on the same page for end-state activities. Ms. Snyder replied yes, they are looking to make sure both parties are on the same page.

Ms. Cimon noted that Hanford has a five-year-plan that may be a value-add concerning what will be reported to the public. Ms. Snyder said that would be a great framework to recommend.

Ms. Leckband then noted that several years ago, some sites had members participate in the end-state discussion, understanding that Hanford is many years down the road. She said it is important for board members to know what the different clean-up levels are and what needs have to be met before the end-state. Ms. Snyder concurred.

Mr. Hull agreed that what Ms. Leckband mentioned is valid and commented that instead of looking completely at the end, his Board is looking at activities as they come up. Therefore, he said, they're not looking at the end-state as a whole but at the mini-end-states. Ms. Snyder agreed that Mr. Hull's comments are in-line with what the charge is trying to accomplish.

Mr. Roberts commented on the fact that at some point DOE will leave their communities—though every site is different. DOE leaving will leave a hole in the community—job loss, for example. He noted that appropriately engaging DOE about what the end should look like is important, and for some sites it might be hard to do this projection. However, engaging in these conversations early is important to prepare the communities. Ms. Snyder agreed and commented

that it is important for the individual boards to do this research so that when the full boards come together, they can adequately put together recommendations that make sense for the entire EM complex.

Ms. Leckband chimed in to comment that because some of the sites have a much longer term while others have a shorter term, the recommendations can split into different types of boxes (short- and long-term recommendations). She lastly thanked everyone since this is her last meeting as an EM SSAB member and Chair.

Ms. Snyder concluded by letting the chairs know she will send the templates out in the next week and thanked the board for their service.

Mr. Christensen noted that the ICP CAB will begin working on the charges starting tomorrow. He thanked everyone for connecting.

The meeting participants thanked Ms. Susan Leckband for her dedicated service to the EM SSAB.

Ms. Snyder updated the group that the next meeting may or may not be in person, but if the meeting is in person, it will be in Nevada. The meeting was adjourned.

Public Comment

No written comments were received before the meeting. One written comment was received after the meeting from Mr. James Kenney, Cabinet Secretary of the New Mexico Environment Department. The comment reads as follows:

- 1. DOE/National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) publicly stated plans to dilute and dispose of non-pit plutonium waste. DOE/NNSA plans to dispose of this waste at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility in Carlsbad, New Mexico. However, DOE/NNSA has not yet discussed the regulatory implications of such plans with NMED nor satisfied the approval conditions of its Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Hazardous Waste Facility Permit issued by the State of New Mexico. The State of New Mexico requests that the EM SSAB carefully consider the ramifications of the incomplete analysis of the proposed final disposition pathway for this waste.**

On December 24, 2015, DOE/NNSA announced in the Federal Register, 80 Fed. Reg 80,348, that its preferred alternative for disposition of the 6 metric tons (MT) of non-pit plutonium was the dilution/downblending of the waste at SRS and disposal at WIPP,

located near Carlsbad, New Mexico, otherwise known as the “WIPP Disposal Alternative.” At that time, DOE/NNSA did not state a preferred alternative for dispositioning the associated 7.1 MT of pit plutonium. In its April 5, 2016 Record of Decision, 81 Fed. Reg. 19,588, DOE/NNSA announced its decision to implement their preferred alternative for the disposition of 6 MT of non-pit plutonium as contact- handled transuranic (CH-TRU) waste for disposal at WIPP. A disposition path for the 7.1 MT of pit plutonium was not decided at this time.

On July 23, 2020, DOE/NNSA announced that SRS had resumed plutonium downblending. In its press release, DOE/NNSA stated that “Plutonium downblending is the process of mixing plutonium oxide with a multicomponent adulterant. After downblending, the plutonium will be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico for disposal.”

On August 28, 2020, DOE/NNSA issued an amended decision in the Federal Register, 85 Fed. Reg. 53,350, stating that it will now dispose of an additional 7.1 MT of pit plutonium as CH-TRU waste at the WIPP facility. According to DOE/NNSA, the process would be the same as described for the 6 MT of non-pit plutonium that DOE/NNSA had previously delineated for disposal at WIPP. Conversion to oxide may be performed at either Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) or at SRS.

DOE Environmental Management must satisfy the requirements in NMED’s Hazardous Waste Facility Permit, Part 2 and Attachment C, in order for this waste to be eligible for disposal at the WIPP facility. To date, it has not specifically been articulated how DOE Environmental Management will ensure compliance with the Permit’s Waste Acceptance Criteria. DOE must engage with NMED to demonstrate such waste will meet the WIPP Waste Acceptance Criteria.

2. The State of New Mexico requests EM SSAB’s support for the reinstatement of \$31.5 M in Land Withdrawal Act funding for the safe transport of SRS waste to the WIPP.

Many DOE facilities across the nation, including SRS, depend heavily on New Mexico’s WIPP for final disposition of eligible waste. The DOE acknowledges in the August 2019 DOE Carlsbad Field Office Strategic Plan 2019-2024 that a major investment in facility maintenance and infrastructure repair recapitalization and modernization is necessary to prevent costly failures and to continue to safely perform mission requirements. Just as the WIPP facility has exceeded its design life and needs regular upgrades and maintenance, the roads in New Mexico also need regular upgrades and maintenance to ensure safe

transport of shipments to WIPP to prevent catastrophic consequences to human health and the environment.

DOE completed the Land Withdrawal Act (LWA) investments in the New Mexico highways leading to the WIPP in 2012, with two DOE-funded road improvement projects in subsequent years one of which was required as part of a settlement agreement associated with an administrative compliance order.

To mitigate risk for all of our nation's DOE facilities, the DOE must reinstate funding to the State of New Mexico as authorized in Section 15 of the LWA and provide an annual appropriation of \$31.5 million in federal fiscal year 2021 and subsequently indexed for inflation for the remaining useful life of WIPP. NMED requests the SRS EM SSAB's support as the State of New Mexico pursues such infrastructure funding associated with impacts from DOE activities within the state.